

1fw
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) Baggott et al. Examiner: Drodge, Joseph W.
Application No.: 10/661,221 Group Art Unit: 1723
Confirmation No: 6822 Docket: 1275-19 RCE
Filed: September 12, 2003 Dated: June 22, 2007
For: PROCESS FOR THE
 REMOVAL OF
 CONTAMINANTS FROM
 WATER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

*I hereby certify this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail,
postpaid in an envelope, addressed to
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
On June 22, 2007*

Signed: Mary Farischon/

Mary Farischon

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

Applicants thank Examiner Drodge for the courteous interview which was held with Applicants' counsel on June 11, 2007. The following summary details the main issues which were discussed during the interview.

At the outset, Applicants' counsel pointed out that the typical feed water that is directly in-line with the reverse osmosis system can go all the way up to 185° as disclosed in the original disclosure on page 10, paragraph 32. In addition, Applicants' counsel took notice that the feed water in some embodiments, at least, is directly in-line with the reversed osmosis system and

Application No.: 10/661,221

Amendment and Response to Office Action dated May 24, 2006

Page 2

in those embodiments, there is no active cooling process in between the two parts. Thus, Applicants' counsel requested the Examiner to consider these combination of features and asked whether such features will overcome the prior art of the Dyke '050 reference.

In addition, Applicants' counsel also pointed out that the prior art reference of the U.S. Patent No. 6,054,050 to Dyke (the "Dyke '050" reference, hereinafter) specifically limits its device to a refinery water stream which was cooled to 110° F. This water stream then flows continuously under its own pressure down through one of the two multi-media sandfilters. This is explicitly stated in col. 6, lines 47 to 50.

Examiner also pointed out that the prior art of the Dyke '050 reference flows continuously under its own pressure and does not entail any external pressure or force.

In addition, the Applicants' counsel provided the U.S. Patent No. 6,071,413 to Dyke and directed the Examiner to review col. 2, lines 51 to 56 of the reference wherein it specifically states that the phenolic stripped sour water is typically at a high temperature, e.g., at a temperature greater than about 150° F. In addition, the Dyke '413 reference also states that it is necessary to reduce the temperature of the sour water to prevent the fouling of the reverse osmosis membrane.

Application No.: 10/661,221

Amendment and Response to Office Action dated May 24, 2006

Page 3

During the discussion of the possible claim languages which may overcome the Dyke '050 reference, the Examiner pointed out that the negative limitations are reviewed with extra scrutiny and are not favorably looked at in approving the application for a patent. Thus, Applicants' counsel stated that he will request his Senior Partner to review the suggested claim languages and reformulate the claims so as to provide the combination of features discussed by the Examiner and counsel in a positive limitation format instead of a negative limitation format.

Applicants believe that the above summary details the content of the interview which was held on June 11, 2007. If there are any other important details which had been omitted by this Interview Summary, Applicants invite the Examiner to submit an additional Interview Summary.

Respectfully submitted,



Darren Kang

Registration No.: 51,859

Attorney for Applicant(s)

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(973) 331-1700